

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11, 16 and 21 are amended. Claim 22 is added.

**I. Personal Interview**

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiner Smith and Primary Examiner Shah at the interview held February 17, 2005, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

**II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter for the same reasons as provided in the September 17, 2004 Office Action. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

During the personal interview, the Examiners pointed out that the Patent Office has changed its position regarding such claims and no longer considers that such claims recite statutory subject matter. Therefore, claim 21 is amended. As the amended claim properly recites patentable subject matter, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,421,733 to Tso et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,463,440 to Hind. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Neither Tso nor Hind, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature recited in the rejected claims as amended. For example, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest a system for managing identity information in a merged content portion, comprising an identity storage that stores identity information including content elements and style sheet information, associated with a client

and user; a client and user determining circuit that determines a sending client and a user of a received request for information from an information provider; a skeleton/virtual content determining circuit that determines which of the stored identity information and the style sheet information correspond to the client and the user to create a skeleton/virtual content record; an input/output circuit that requests and receives the information from the information provider; and a merging circuit that determines a merged content portion based on received information and the skeleton/virtual content record associated with at least one of the client and the user to render the merged content portion to maintain a look and feel of a client website.

Additionally, the combination of references fails to disclose or suggest a method for managing identity information, as recited in claim 6, a computer storage medium, as recited in claim 11, a system for managing identity information, as in claim 16, or a computer product, as recited in claim 21.

Tso discloses a system for dynamically transcoding data transmitted between two computers over a communications link (col. 1, lines 10-14). Tso deploys a "smart" proxy server to transcode (manipulate) data requested from a client server (col. 3, lines 8-40). When a network client 12 requests a hypertext object, HTTP remote proxy retrieves the hypertext object from a parser 22 which is part of a remote server. A transcode service provider 24 is selected to transcode the data prior to returning the requested object to the client (col. 6, lines 24-50). The parser 22 may selectively invoke a particular transcode service provider 24 based upon satisfaction of a predetermined selection criterion, such as for example, information contained in a header portion of a data packet received by the transcoding server 34 (col. 6, line 64 – col. 7, line 2).

The Office Action admits that Tso does not disclose an identity storage that stores identity information including style sheet information which is used to render the merged

content portion according to the style sheet information. To overcome the admitted deficiency, the Office Action combines Hind and alleges that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hind into Tso to have created the claimed invention.

Even were the combination made as proposed in the Office Action, the combination of references fails to disclose each and every feature recited in the rejected claims. For example, although Hind discloses a method system and computer-readable code for retrieving style sheets from a director or repository based on characteristics associated with the style sheets, Hind fails to disclose or suggest merging the selected style sheet with a retrieved content portion from an information provider to render a merged content portion. Similarly, Tso fails to disclose any such merger of data. Thus, the combination of references does not render the claimed subject matter obvious.

Furthermore, the combination of references fails to disclose the additional features recited in the rejected claims. For example, neither Tso nor Hind, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a skeleton/virtual content determining circuit that determines which of the stored identity information and the style sheet information correspond to the client and the user to create a skeleton/virtual content record. Additionally, as the skeleton/virtual content record is used to determine the merged content portion to maintain a look and feel of a client website, each and every feature recited in the rejected claims is not disclosed or suggested by the combination of references.

Similarly, the combination of references fails to disclose a method for managing identity information that includes creating a skeleton/virtual content record based on the identity information and the style sheet information, or determining a merged content portion based on the received information and the skeleton/virtual content record, and outputting the merged content portion to maintain a look and feel of a client website as recited in claim 6.

Similarly, the combination of references fails to disclose a computer-readable storage medium that performs the functions as recited in claim 11, or any of the additional features recited in revised claim 16 or 21. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C.

§103(a) is respectfully requested.

**IV. New Claim**

None of the applied references, whether considered alone or in combination, disclose or suggest a method for managing the look and feel of a web site, comprising: receiving an information request from a user; determining an identity of a client associated with the information request; determining content elements and presentation elements associated with the client; retrieving the requested information from an information provider; creating a virtual content record based on the content elements and the presentation elements of the client; merging the retrieved requested information and the virtual content record to create a document consistent with the content elements and presentation elements associated with the client; and outputting the document to the user, as recited in claim 22.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-22 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

John W. Fitzpatrick  
Registration No. 41,018

JAO:JWF/ldg

Date: April 14, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
---